

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 7, 2003 has been reviewed and carefully considered.

Claims 1-21, 44 and 46-48 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for a matter of informality. In particular, the duplicate use of reference numerals 447 and 449. Applicant has amended Figure 2 and corresponding portions of the specification to remove the duplicate use of elements 447 and 449.

The Examiner has objected to the specification for several informalities. Applicant has amended the specification where appropriate to include the missing reference numerals shown in the drawings. In particular, elements 215, 300 and 62, 64 of Figures 1, 3 and 1 8, respectively, have been added to the specification by the amendments thereto. With respect to reference numeral 510, applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to page 10, line 20 of the specification. At page 8, the reference to numerals 420-433 has been corrected by the amendments to the second paragraph of the same. At page 11, the reference to numerals 805-850 has been corrected by the amendments to the paragraph containing the same.

Claims 22-42 and 45-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has canceled claims 22-42 and 45 without prejudice and has amended claim 46. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-8 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,818,935 to Maa. Applicant's independent claims 1 and 19 include, *inter alia*, a type indicator identifying a multimedia object type to use in decoding the multimedia object. The Examiner states, *inter alia*, "Further, the information contains a type indicator for identifying a multimedia object type...for use in decoding the object."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Maa. Maa specifically teaches a system that extracts an internet information pointer from a video signal and enables connection to the internet using the directed pointer encoded in the video signal. As such, the **type** of multimedia object is of no concern to Maa, as it is always an internet pointer that is being extracted from the video signal, and as such, no decoding is required to identify the type of multimedia object, as it is always known. In stark contrast, the present invention handles a plurality of different multimedia objects and therefore requires the use of a type indicator in order to identify the type of multimedia object before proceeding with the decoding. Maa clearly teaches away from this aspect of applicant's claimed invention since no such *multimedia* type identification is necessary. Therefore, Maa does not anticipate, and actually teaches away from applicant's claimed invention in this respect. Withdrawal of the rejection and early allowance on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-8 and 20-21 depend from claims 1 and 19, and are therefore believed to be allowable based on the clear differences recited above for the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatenable over Maa in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,768,539 to Metz et al. Claim 3 ultimately depends from claim 1 and as such is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 9-11, 44 and 46-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Maa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 to Matthews III et al.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and therefore is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons cited above. Furthermore, the application of Matthews III et al. to this claim is moot in view of the aforementioned distinction between Maa and the present invention.

Independent claim 10, includes a type indicator for identifying a multimedia object type... As explained above, Maa, taken singly or in combination with Matthews III et al., does not disclose nor suggest the use of a multimedia object type identifier for use in decoding the multimedia object. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claim 11 depends from claim 10, and therefore is believed to be allowable in its current form.

Independent claim 44 recites, *inter alia*, ".....a third identifier for identifying a location of data representing a video program in said packetized program information....." Neither Maa, nor Matthews III et al., taken singly or in any combination, discloses or suggests this claimed feature of applicant's invention. As such, this feature of applicant's claimed represents a clear departure from the teachings of the combined references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 46-48 depend from Claim 44 and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance as well.

Claims 12-13 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Matthews III et al. in view of Maa. Independent claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, a type indicator identifying a multimedia object for use in decoding the multimedia object. As admitted by the Examiner Matthews III et al does not disclose or suggest this feature of applicant's claimed invention. As explained above with respect to claim 1, Maa does not teach the use of a type identifier and therefore the combination of Maa with Matthews III et al does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of applicant's invention. The format specifier of Maa is used to indicate an encoding format of any subsequent text portions of the message body and is clearly not for identifying the *type* of multimedia object. Withdrawal and early allowance on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 15-18 depend from claim 12 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons cited herein.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Matthews III et al. in view of Maa in further view of Metz et al. Claim 14 ultimately depends from claim 12, and thus contains all the limitations thereof and therefore is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons cited above with respect to independent claim 12. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Claims 22-25, 32-34 and 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Maa in view of well known prior art. These claims have been canceled from the application.

Claims 26-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Maa in view of well known prior art in further view of Matthews III et al. These claims have been canceled from the application.

Claims 37-40 stand rejected under under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Matthews III et al. in view of Maa And further in view of well known prior art. These claims have been canceled from the application.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's representatives Deposit Account No.

Respectfully submitted,

  
By *Jeffrey M. Nason*

Dated:

*Nov. 25, 2003*

FIGURE 2

